chickens that insist on making their nests in the roadway, the rule applied in Cohen *v.* Borgenecht, 144 New York Supplement, 399, offers a solace, but to the father of a reckless son or a speed-loving daughter the rule spells more trouble. It was there held that where the owner of an automobile provided it for the use of his family, and directed the chauffeur to take their orders, the owner is liable for any injury caused by the chauffeur's neglect while acting under his son's order; he being in the owner's employ, though running the machine in obedience to the directions of members of the family.

Maternity Does Not Disqualify Teacher.—Greater New York Charter (Laws 1901, c. 466), § 1093, provides that a teacher may be removed for misconduct, insubordination, neglect of duty, and general inefficiency, while the by-laws of the school board provide that a teacher's absence may be excused when caused by serious personal illness, death in the teacher's immediate family, compliance with the requirements of the court, and quarantine established by the board of health. In the case of People *v.* Board of Education, 144 New York Supplement 87, the Supreme Court, Special Term, New York County, held that, as a female teacher might marry without being subject to removal, the charter grounds being exclusive, and as serious personal illness will, under the by-laws, excuse absence, the absence of a married female teacher on account of maternity does not constitute neglect of duty authorizing dismissal.

Fingers in Wrong Place.—At certain times in our lives we would like to lose our hands and feet. When we go calling the first time, or have the photographer attempt to make us look graceful and happy and other things we are not, or attend our first banquet with about 14 separate knives, forks, and spoons in close proximity to our plate, whereas we were accustomed to eating by Nature's own method, our pedal and manual extremities are the largest appearing, most cumbersome, and awkward things ever created. Some people never learn what to do with their hands and fingers. They usually begin by having them slapped, and end by having them burnt. Others are simply unfortunate, as was the plaintiff in Pendergrast *v.* Durham Traction Co. (Supreme Court of North Carolina) 79 Southeastern Reporter, 984. Plaintiff, in alighting from a moving street car, took hold of a grabhandle, when a ring which he wore on his little finger became caught in a screw head which projected above the surface hardly a sixteenth of an inch, with the result that his finger was torn off. The lower court's dismissal of the action for damages was affirmed by the Supreme Court. "Giving due consideration to the circumstances of the obscure placing of the screw, * * * that the

plaintiff was caught in a very thin finger ring on his left hand, and that the wrench was given by the forward movement of the car, which had never stopped, and from which he was in the act of alighting, we are of opinion that the case comes clearly within the category of inevitable accident, and for which the defendant should not be held responsible."

Biting by Wife Justifies Self-Defense.—Security from physical injury and pain are now the right of a husband. That a man may defend himself against the attacks of his wife has been recognized as a right by a court. Whether the doctrine may ever be so far extended as to relieve from mental suffering and anguish, by affording injunctive relief against the wife's "callings" and admonitions as to late hours and the husband's closest associates, can be settled by time only. But some of his rights were laid down by the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas, in Kelton *v.* State, 160 Southwestern Reporter, 342. This case arose out of a prosecution for assault. The only evidence for the state was that the wife of accused had asked him for money to visit relatives, and was told that he did not have it, but would have it for her a little later; that she became angry, striking him on the head with a bucket, and then biting his shoulder, when he reached down and got a rock and struck back over his shoulder, making a small cut on her head. In reversing a verdict for erroneous instruction the court held that, "While the assault upon a woman usually is aggravated assault, this does not deprive a party of his right of self-defense against an assault. His right to defend himself against the attack of a woman, or against his wife, under these circumstances, would be the same as her right of self-defense against him or against any other person."

Right of a Railroad Company to Name Its Stations.—In a Washington case a railroad maintained a station within the unincorporated town of Bingen, which had a population of 100, and which furnished about 10 per cent. of the company's business at that point; distant about a mile and a half was the incorporated town of White Salmon, which had a population of 800 and furnished 60 per cent. of the business at that point, and was the trading point of surrounding territory with a population of over 3,500, known as the "White Salmon Valley." The railroad company, having changed the name of the station from Bingen to White Salmon, was ordered by the State Railroad Commission to show on all tariffs, folders, and tickets both names in combination as the name of the same station. The county court affirmed the order of the commission, and the company appealed. The Supreme Court rules that the order of the commission was in-